

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

As a result of this amendment, claims 1, 3-8, 13-14, 16, 21 and 24-28 are pending, claims 1, 5, 13 and 14 having been newly amended, claims 9, 11 and 12 having been newly canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 25-28 having been newly added.

Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute the canceled claims in a continuation application.

Rejection of Claims 9 and 11-12

On page 4 of the non-Final Office Action of August 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant canceled claims 9 and 11-12, thereby making the rejection moot.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16, 21 and 24

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,411 to Gong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,670 to Kosanovic, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,008,941 to Sejnova. Applicant submits that amended claims 1, 5, 13 and 14 obviate the rejection. Claims 9, 11 and 12 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection of claims 9, 11 and 12 moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9, 11 and 12 withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The method includes, among other things, determining parameters of a background model and a transducer model at a periodic time during a received voice request

and increasing the periodic time when successive changes in sampled noise information and sampled transducer information do not exceed a threshold. Independent claims 5 and 13 recite similar features.

On page 3 of the non-Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that neither Sejnoha nor any other cited prior art discloses or suggests increasing a periodic time for updating a transducer model when successive changes in sampled transducer information do not exceed a threshold value, or in combination with other elements of claims 1, 5, or 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest increasing the periodic time when successive changes in sampled noise information and sampled transducer information do not exceed a threshold value, as required by claims 1, 5 and 13. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5 and 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 recite features similar to those of claims 1, 5 and 13 and is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 13. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 16, 21 and 24 depend from claim 1 or claim 5 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1 or claim 5. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6-8, 16, 21 and 24 be withdrawn.

New Claims 25-28

New claims 25-28 depend from claim 13 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 13.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2006

By: /Richard C. Irving/

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433